

Amendment of claims

Claims 4, 5, 11, 13, 15, and 26 are amended for clarity and not for overcoming any arts cited by the Examiner. The amendment of these claims do not narrow the claim scope.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4 and 6-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Eichelberger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,148).

Independent claims 1 and 10 recite a microelectronic die having a plurality of bond pads on an active surface of the microelectronic die. Claims 1 and 10 also recite an interfacial metal layer having a plurality of separate conductive elements including at least one conductive element that is conductively coupled to “multiple” bond pads.

Eichelberger et al. disclose a die having a plurality of bond pads and conductive elements. However, Eichelberger et al. do not disclose in that one of the conductive elements is coupled to “multiple” bond pads. None of the figures of Eichelberger et al. shows that one of the conductive elements is coupled to “multiple” bond pads. For example, FIG. 1 and FIG. 2 of Eichelberger et al. show that element 108 is coupled to only a “single” bond pad of die 102. Notice that element 114 is also coupled to a “single” bond pad. FIG. 3G and FIG. 4F also show that element 109 is coupled to only a “single” bond pad. FIG. 6B and FIG. 7B also show that element 209 is coupled to only a “single” bond pad. Further, FIG. 6C and FIG. 7C show a solder ball 234 being coupled to only a “single” bond pad. Thus, Eichelberger et al. do not disclose that at least one conductive element is coupled to “multiple” bond pads.

In light of the reasons presented above, claims 1 and 10 are not anticipated by Eichelberger et al. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 10 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that claims 1 and 10 and their dependent claims be allowed.

Independent claim 20 is amended. As amended, claim 20 recites elements that are similar to the elements of claims 1 and 10. Thus, the amended claim 20 is not anticipated by Eichelberger et al. for reasons similar to the reasons presented above regarding claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 20 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that claim 20 and its dependent claims be allowed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eichelberger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,148).

Claim 6 depends on claim 1. In light of the reasons presented above in the 102 section, claim 1 is patentable over Eichelberger et al. Thus, claim 6 is also patentable over Eichelberger et al because it depends on a patentable claim. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 6 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that claim 6 be allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative (612) 373-6969 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

QUAT T. VU ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 373-6969

Date

12-30-02

By



Viet V. Tong

Reg. No. 45.416

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 30th day of December, 2002.

**Candis B. Buending**

Name

Signature

